

R E M A R K S

- Claims 2, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18, and 29 to 32 were previously cancelled
- Independent claims 1, 19, 14 and 24 have been amended herein
- New claims 33 to 36 are added herein
- Claims 1, 3, 6 to 9, 13, 14, 16, 19 to 28, and 33 to 36 will be pending upon entry of this amendment

The amendments to the claims do not present new matter. Reconsideration of the patentability of the pending claims is respectfully requested in light of the following discussion.

Rejection of claims 1, 3, 6 - 9, 13, and 29-32 under 35

U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3, 6 - 9, 13, and 29-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Wang* (US 5,035,389) in view of *Weisman* (US 1,182,610).

Respectfully, the rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

First, it is believed that the rejection of claims 29-32 is in error, as such claims were cancelled in the last communication.

In regards to the substantive rejections, the Wang reference describes a locking and support mechanism which discloses ribs whose medial surfaces define right angles with a plane defined by the first, second, third and fourth sides of a trapezoidal plate. In the Wang locking device, upon entry of its engagement member 111 into the channels

22 of its attaching member 21, the free ends of the member 111 snap into place to prevent removal (i.e., providing a locking feature). Wang does not have a medial channel surface at all, let alone a medial channel surface which forms an oblique angle of the overhead carrier support.

To overcome this deficiency, the Weisman reference has been introduced, asserting that a person of ordinary skill in the art would modify Wang by the addition of an angle. However, the Weisman device is used for securing two components together, by the use a wedge 6. Nothing is secured to the wedge 6 itself, it simply operates as the article that securely holds the coupling members 3 and 4 together. To be clear, no article is coupled to the wedge. Thus, nothing in Weisman teaches or suggests that the Weisman device may be adapted as an overhead transfer flange to couple to a substrate carrier body. Furthermore, there is nothing in Wang that motivates adding of an angle in the first place, as it is not clear whether an addition of such a feature would detract from the locking feature. In any event, it seems to add nothing to the functionality of the Wang locking device, and, thus, there would be no motivation to add it.

Respectfully then, it is asserted the combination is flawed because the two devices (Wang and Wiesman) are not similar in function, and a person of ordinary skill in the art would not look to such non-similar devices to incorporate and combined features therefrom. Further, there is no suggestion in Wang that indicates that the addition of an angle would be functionally desirable in any way. Thus, it would not be obvious to combine Wang and Wiesman.

Accordingly, Applicants' attorney submits that independent claims 1, 9 are patentable over *Wang* in view of *Wiesman* and that claims 3, 6 - 9, and 13 which depend therefrom would be patentable for at least these reasons.

Rejection of claims 14, 16, 19, 21 - 24 under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a)

Claims 14, 16, 19, 21 - 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jones* (US 2,588,009) in view of *Wiesman* (US 1,182,610).

Applicants submit that claim 14 is patentable over *Jones* for similar reasons as espoused above for claims 1 and 9. Specifically, the *Jones* reference does not disclose channels having medial surfaces which form oblique angles with a plane defined by the first, second, third and fourth sides. Furthermore, to the extent that an argument can be made that *Jones* does disclose blades, which Applicants' assert it does not, those blades would be parallel to the plane of the flange, i.e., not forming an oblique angle with the plane of the flange. Additionally, *Jones* does not disclose an overhead carrier support adapted to suspend a substrate carrier. Only devices for supporting wall mirrors are disclosed.

Moreover, Applicants submit that the *Wiesman* reference fails to cure the deficiencies of *Jones*. The angled device relied upon by Examiner in *Weisman* is not a coupling at all, but a wedge. Accordingly, it is a very dissimilar device in its function (a wedge versus a coupling), and would not be looked to by a person of ordinary skill in the art for modifying the *Jones* device. Moreover, it is unclear what advantage would be forthcoming by adding an

angle to Jones. For these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 14 is unobvious and patentable over *Jones* in view of *Wiesman*. Dependent claims 16, 19, 21 - 23 are patentable for at least these reasons.

As to claim 24, the combination of Jones and Wiesman is flawed for the same reasons espoused for claims 1 and 9 above. In particular, *Jones* does not disclose blades with an oblique angle with the plane of the flange. And nothing in Weisman teaches or suggests that the Weisman device may be adapted as an overhead transfer flange to couple to a substrate carrier body. The Weisman angled member is a wedge and nothing more. Furthermore, there is nothing in Jones that motivates adding of an angle in the first place. Accordingly, independent claim 24 is unobvious and thus patentable for at least these reasons.

Rejection of claims 16, 20, 25-26, and 27-28 under 35

U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 16, 20, 25-26, and 27-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Jones* in view of *Wiesman* in various combinations with Wang, Stromberg (US 2,008,087) and Perlov.

Claims 16, 20, 25-26, and 27-28 depend from independent claims 14 and 24 discussed above. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 16, 20, 25-26, and 27-28 are patentable over *Jones* for at least the same reasons as set forth above. Specifically, the *Jones* reference does not disclose blades on a flange at all, let alone blades having medial surfaces which form oblique angles with a plane defined by the first, second, third and fourth sides of the transfer flange. And Weisman is not properly combinable

with Jones. In addition, Applicants submit that the Wang, Stromberg (US 2,008,087) and Perlov references fail to cure the deficiencies of the combination of *Jones and Wiesman*. For these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 16, 20, 25-26, and 27-28 are patentable over *Jones* in view of *Wiesman* in various combinations with Wang, Stromberg (US 2,008,087) and Perlov.

Further Amendments

To further clarify the invention, Applicants hereby amend claims 1, 9, 14 and 24 to add the clarifying language that the support is an overhead carrier support for an overhead transfer conveyor. Coupling to a support of an overhead transfer conveyor is not taught or suggested in any of the references relied upon for making the present rejection. With these amendments and the lack of proper motivation for combining the references, it is asserted that the present claims 1, 3, 6 - 9, 13, 14, 16, 19 - 28, and 33 - 36 are allowable over the cited references.

New Claims

New claims 33-36 have been added. No new matter is added. These claims are patentable for at least the reasons given for claims 1 and 14, and for the further reasons that the art of record does not teach or suggest adding non-parallel surfaces (129ab, 129aa) to form the blade, and non-parallel surfaces (121aa, 121ab) to form the channels as best shown in the FIG. 5 of the present application. Adding such surfaces may minimize relative motion between the coupled members during transfer and

thereby reduce particle generation which may be a
contaminant in electronic device manufacturing.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants believe all pending claims are in
condition for allowance, and respectfully request
reconsideration and allowance of the same.

The Applicants have enclosed herewith a Request for an
Extension of Time and an authorization to charge the
requisite fees to credit card number being submitted via
EFS-web. The Applicants do not believe any additional
Request for Extension of Time is required but if it is,
please accept this paragraph as a request for such an
Extension of Time and authorization to charge the requisite
extension fee to Deposit Account No. 04-1696.

The Applicants do not believe any other fees are due
regarding this amendment. If any other fees are required,
however, please charge Deposit Account No. 04-1696.

The Applicants encourage the Examiner to telephone
Applicants' attorney should any issues remain.

Respectfully Submitted,



Steven M. Santisi, Esq.
Registration No. 40,157
Dugan & Dugan, PC
Attorneys for Applicants
(914) 579-2200

Dated: September 1, 2008
Hawthorne, New York